

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Cory Watkins

Serial No.: 10/623,283

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: A126.111.102

Title: INSPECTION TOOL WITH PARTIAL FRAMING CAMERA

---

**REMARKS**

This is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed September 12, 2006. In that Office Action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-7 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/623,282. Claims 8-15 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 and 12-16 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/623,282 in view of Roberts, U.S. Patent No. 5,541,654 ("Roberts").

Claims 5-7, 13-15, and 17-19 were objected to due to informalities.

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts. Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann, U.S. Patent No. 6,693,664 and Roberts. Claims 6, 14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann and Roberts, and further in view of Tsuneta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,570,156 ("Tsuneta"). Claims 7, 15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann and Roberts, and further in view of Isogai et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,457,232 ("Isogai").

With this Response, claims 4 and 12 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 5-8, 13-15, and 17-19 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-19 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

**Rejections under Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting**

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-7 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/623,282. Claims 8-15 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 and 12-16 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/623,282 in view of Roberts, U.S. Patent No. 5,541,654 ("Roberts"). Applicants have submitted herewith a

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Cory Watkins

Serial No.: 10/623,283

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: A126.111.102

Title: INSPECTION TOOL WITH PARTIAL FRAMING CAMERA

---

Terminal Disclaimer filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.321 along with the appropriate fees to obviate the Examiner's double patenting rejection.

**Objection to Claims**

Claims 5-7, 13-15, and 17-19 were objected to due to informalities. Claims 5-7, 13-15, and 17-19 have been amended as shown above to address the Examiner's objections. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 5-7, 13-15, and 17-19 is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts. Amended independent claim 1 recites "an inspection system including at least a camera with the ability to selectively readout a number of rows, wherein the inspection system is configured to inspect semiconductor substrates". Amended independent claim 8 recites "an inspection device including at least a camera with the ability to selectively readout groups of pixels in one axis of an imager of the camera, wherein the inspection device is configured to inspect semiconductor substrates". There is no teaching or suggestion in Roberts regarding an inspection system or device that is configured to inspect semiconductor substrates.

In view of the above, independent claims 1 and 8 are not taught or suggested by Roberts. In addition, dependent claims 2-3 and 9-10, which further limit patentably distinct claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are further distinguishable over the cited reference, are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and allowance of claims 1-3 and 8-10, are respectfully requested.

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Cory Watkins

Serial No.: 10/623,283

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: A126.111.102

Title: INSPECTION TOOL WITH PARTIAL FRAMING CAMERA

---

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann, U.S. Patent No. 6,693,664 and Roberts. Amended independent claim 1 recites "an inspection system including at least a camera with the ability to selectively readout a number of rows, wherein the inspection system is configured to inspect semiconductor substrates". Amended independent claim 8 recites "an inspection device including at least a camera with the ability to selectively readout groups of pixels in one axis of an imager of the camera, wherein the inspection device is configured to inspect semiconductor substrates". Independent claim 16 is directed to an automated method of inspecting a plurality of semiconductor die, and recites "reading out pixel data from the imager for each captured frame, the pixel data for each captured frame including a second number of rows of pixels that is less than the first number of rows of pixels".

The Examiner acknowledged that Neumann does not teach or suggest "a camera with the ability to selectively readout a number of rows" as recited in independent claims 1 and 8, but indicated that Roberts discloses this limitation. (Office Action at para. no. 8, pages 8 and 11). The Examiner also acknowledged that Neumann does not teach or suggest "the pixel data for each captured frame including a second number of rows of pixels that is less than the first number of rows of pixels", as recited in independent claim 16, but indicated that Roberts discloses this limitation. (Office Action at para. no. 8, page 15).

Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1, 8, and 16 has not been established, because there is no suggestion to combine the cited references. The Federal Circuit has stated, "[i]n holding an invention obvious in view of a combination of references, there must be some suggestion, motivation, or teaching in the prior art that would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to select the references and combine them in the way that would produce the claimed invention."

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Cory Watkins

Serial No.: 10/623,283

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: A126.111.102

Title: INSPECTION TOOL WITH PARTIAL FRAMING CAMERA

---

*Karsten Manufacturing Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 58 U.S.P.Q.2d 1286, 1293 (CAFC 2001).

The Examiner contends that one would be motivated to modify Neumann according to Roberts to speed up processing and reduce the buffer (see, e.g., Office Action at para. no. 8, pages 8-9). This disclosure in Roberts regarding speeding up processing does not provide a motivation to combine any arbitrary teaching of Roberts with any arbitrary reference in any arbitrary manner. This argument ignores the imaging and defect detection technique disclosed in Neumann, as addressed in further detail below.

Neumann discloses a system for detection of wafer defects using a focal plane assembly 30 that includes an array of twenty-four high-resolution (1940 x 1035 pixels) CCD devices 52 to produce images of about forty-eight million pixels. (See, e.g., Neumann at Abstract; col. 9, lines 39-45; col. 10, lines 49-60). The field of view of the imaging system disclosed in Neumann is substantially less than the size of the semiconductor die, so multiple forty-eight million pixel images of each die are captured. (See, e.g., Neumann at Figures 5B and 6, and corresponding description).

Roberts discloses an imaging device 10 with random access of image elements. (See, e.g., Roberts at Abstract). Roberts discloses that the imaging device includes 512 x 512 pixels, 200 x 200 pixels, or 128 x 128 pixels. (Roberts at col. 4, lines 47-51, and col. 12, line 42).

There is no teaching or suggestion in Roberts regarding a system, device, or method for inspecting semiconductor substrates or die. There is no teaching or suggestion in Roberts that the imaging device disclosed therein could or should be used in an inspection system or device. There is no teaching or suggestion in Neumann that the high-resolution, forty-eight million pixel focal plane assembly 30 disclosed therein, or any portion thereof, could or should be replaced by the low-resolution imaging device 10 disclosed in Roberts. Rather, Neumann teaches away from such a modification by repeatedly emphasizing the need for capturing very high-resolution images (e.g., 48

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Cory Watkins

Serial No.: 10/623,283

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: A126.111.102

Title: INSPECTION TOOL WITH PARTIAL FRAMING CAMERA

---

million pixels). (See, e.g. Neumann at col. 2, lines 44-46; col. 5, lines 34-36; col. 6, lines 1-6; col. 8, lines 25-28; col. 9, lines 40-45; col. 10, lines 48-60; and col. 11, lines 1-6). There is also no teaching or suggestion in Neumann that it would be desirable to use an imaging device with random access of image elements, such as that disclosed in Roberts. Rather, since the device in Neumann only images a small portion of each die at a time (see, e.g., Neumann at Figures 5B and 6, and corresponding description), and compares each such image to a corresponding image from an adjacent die, all of the captured image data is needed and used in the disclosed system for defect detection (See, e.g., Neumann at col. 18, lines 17-52), and there is no teaching or suggestion in Neumann that it would be desirable or even possible to only use a subset or window of the captured image data. In fact, with the system disclosed in Neumann, using only a subset or window of the captured image data of the die may result in missed defects or misregistration of the images to be compared.

In view of the above, independent claims 1, 8, and 16 are not taught or suggested by Neumann and Roberts. In addition, dependent claims 2-5, 9-13, and 17, which further limit patentably distinct claim 1, 8, or 16, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allowance of claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 17, are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-5, 9-13, and 17 are also further distinguishable over the cited references. For example, dependent claim 5 recites "wherein the controller is configured to program the camera to readout the specified number of rows **based on a size of the semiconductor die.**" Dependent claim 13 recites "wherein the controller is configured to program the camera to readout the specified number of groups of pixels **based on a size of the semiconductor die.**" Dependent claim 17 recites "programming the camera to read out the second number of rows of pixels **based on a size of the semiconductor die**". The Examiner acknowledged that Neumann does not teach or suggest the above-recited limitations of claims 5, 13, and 17. (Office Action at

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Cory Watkins

Serial No.: 10/623,283

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: A126.111.102

Title: INSPECTION TOOL WITH PARTIAL FRAMING CAMERA

---

para. no. 8, pages 10, 13, and 16). Roberts also does not teach or suggest the above-recited limitations of claims 5, 13, and 17. There is no teaching or suggestion in Roberts regarding a system, device, or method for inspecting semiconductor substrates or die, let alone programming a camera to read out a number of rows based on a size of a semiconductor die.

Claims 6, 14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann and Roberts, and further in view of Tsuneta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,570,156 ("Tsuneta"). Dependent claims 6, 14, and 18, which further limit patentably distinct claims 1, 8, and 16, respectively, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 14, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allowance of claims 6, 14, and 18 are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann and Roberts, and further in view of Isogai et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,457,232 ("Isogai"). Dependent claims 7, 15, and 19, which further limit patentably distinct claims 1, 8, and 16, respectively, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 15, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allowance of claims 7, 15, and 19 are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-19 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-19 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0471.

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Cory Watkins

Serial No.: 10/623,283

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: A126.111.102

Title: INSPECTION TOOL WITH PARTIAL FRAMING CAMERA

---

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Dicke, Billig & Czaja, PLLC**  
ATTN: Christopher McLaughlin  
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250  
100 South Fifth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Respectfully submitted,

Cory Watkins,

By his attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC  
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250  
100 South Fifth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 573-0178  
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 10/24/06

JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen

Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 24<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2006.

By: Jeff A. Holmen

Name: Jeff A. Holmen